

REMARKS

This amendment and RCE are in response to the Office Action mailed June 13, 2007.

Claim Objections

Claims 1,60,73 are objected to because of the following informalities.....

Typos and grammar errors in claims 1, 60, 73 have been amended.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC 112

Claims 1-30, 60-101 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

"The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-101 have been amended and become definite with the amendment and thus the withdrawal of the rejections on claims 1-30, 60-101 are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC 103

Claims 1-10, 15-19, 22, 25-28, 60-65, 67-81 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pearlman et al. ('Pearlman' hereinafter) ("A community authorization service for group collaboration" by Pearlman, L., Welch, V., Foster, I., Kesselman, C. and Tuecke, S.; Policies for Distributed Systems and Networks, 2002. Proceedings Third International Workshop on 5-7 June 2002; Page(s): 50 - 59) in view of Sutherland et al. ('Sutherland' hereinafter) (Publication Number 2002/0120757)

*As per claim 1, Pearlman teaches
A virtual community system over a plurality of users and a plurality of resources accessible by said plurality of users comprising: (see abstract)*

and said server operable to associate each of said plurality of resources accessed by each of said user to said each user; (individuals using resources, section I)

and said server operable to form a dynamic community for each of said plurality of resources; (collaboratories, section I, second paragraph)

said community comprising each of said plurality of users who is accessing the same said each of plurality of resources. (collaboratories, section I, second paragraph)

Pearlman does not explicitly indicate "a server operable to monitor each of said plurality of users accessing said plurality of resources").

However, Sutherland disclosed "a server operable to monitor each of said plurality of users accessing said plurality of resources").(user associated with content, paragraph [0013]).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Pearlman and Sutherland because using the steps of "a server operable to monitor each of said plurality of users accessing said plurality of resources" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to

improved the invention by allowing content to be shared. This gives the user the advantage of being able to collaborate with other users.

The office action contends that Pearlman teaches the aforementioned feature of the system of independent claim 1. This contention is respectfully traversed.

Sutherland disclosed a system for granting group permissions to specific resources to users, a system permitting many non-trusted administrators, with minimal knowledge of other system users, to securely create ad hoc groups from both existing system users and those previously outside the system and manage corresponding resource permissions for such groups and in some cases, for individuals within such groups. It allows the owner of a resource selects the level of access for the new group when it is created. The owner then requests the system to generate an appropriate sign-up URL (as defined below) to be sent to the email addresses of the prospective member and non-member users. In the paragraph, the sign-up URL might include coded references to multiple group invitations. It mentions that prospective clients might be invited to view a set of such resources by receiving a sign-up URL automatically placing such client into the "groups" for properties that the agent feels the client will have an interest.

Sutherland does not teach forming a community based on monitoring users accessing a resource and automatically put all resource users into a parallel community that so that they could communicate with each other, In fact, every user in a new group has to be invited directly by another member who create and maintains a new group, and each group is maintained by a particular user but not a community based on the resource using. Thus Sutherland teaches away from forming a community based on resource using.

In view of this, Applicant respectfully disagrees with the statement that Sutherland, [paragraph 0013] teaches a server operable to monitor the user accessing a resource. The referred lines merely describe a created resource

could belong to multiple groups and a user could be invited to view a set of such resources by receiving a signup URL that references multiple groups. Thus the referenced lines of Sutherland do not support the statement made.

Claim 1, as amended, also shows steps of how the community for a particular resource is formed in a virtual community system based on accessing a resource.

With amendment of claim 1, the scope and concept of virtual community used in this patent application differs from virtual communities or virtual organizations referred to by Pearlman in "A community authorization service for group collaboration". In Pearlman's system, the server adds a user to the CAS database because the server is managing the accessing rights of the user accessing the system. This differs from our system while the community server does not manage the rights and permission of a user accessing a resource. Those accessing rights or permissions are provided either by the resource owner or by the original system.

In view of these reasons, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 as anticipated by Pearlman appears in order and is respectfully requested.

Claim 73 rejection states:

A method of forming virtual community in a system with a plurality of users and a plurality of resources, the method comprising the steps of: (see abstract) each of said plurality of users accesses said plurality of resources; (collaboratories, section I, second paragraph)

said server associates each of said plurality of resources accessed by each of said plurality of users to said each user; (collaboratories, section I, second paragraph)

and said server forms a dynamic community for each of said plurality of resources, said community comprising of each of said plurality of users who is

accessing the same said each of plurality of resources. (communities with resources, section 1)

Pearlman does not explicitly indicate 'a server monitors each of said plurality of users accessing said plurality of resources'.

However, Sutherland discloses "a server monitors each of said plurality of users accessing said plurality of resources" (user associated with content, paragraph [0013]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Pearlman and Sutherland because using the steps of "a server monitors each of said plurality of users accessing said plurality of resources" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by allowing content to be shared, This gives the user the advantage of being able to collaborate with other users.

Claim 73 has also been amended in a similar way to Claim 1.

In additional, in Pearlman's system, the system manages resource's accessing rights and permissions in a CAS server; while in Sutherland's email system discusses granting group permission to users. Similar analysis pertaining to Claim 1 can also be applied to the amended claim 73, and reference does not teach the particular monitoring step of claim 73.

Thus withdrawal of the rejection of claim 73 as anticipated by Pearlman appears in order and is respectfully requested.

Claim 60 rejection states:

As per claim 60, Pearlman teaches

A universal virtual communities system over a plurality of users and a plurality of resources accessible by said plurality of users comprising of: (see abstract)

a user access database that containing resource accessing record from each of said plurality of users to each of said plurality of resources a universal

virtual community server operable to monitor every access from each of said plurality of users to each of said plurality of resources and then performs additional functions of: (server entry for user contains action, section 3, third paragraph)

storing said access to said user access database; (server entries, section 3, third paragraph)

updating said virtual community area with said access from said user to said resource. (server entry for user contains action, section 3, third paragraph).

Pearlman does not explicitly indicate 'a plurality of virtual community areas, where each of said plurality of resources is mapped to one said plurality of virtual community areas by a uniform resource locator (URL) and each of said plurality of virtual community areas contains community and user accessing information for said mapped resource' nor "mapping said accessed resource to said virtual community area by said uniform resource locator (URL)"

However, Sutherland discloses "a plurality of virtual community areas, where each of said plurality of resources is mapped to one said plurality of virtual community areas by a uniform resource locator (URL) and each of said plurality of virtual community areas contains community and user accessing information for said mapped resource" (URL invitation to user for group albums, paragraphs [0031]) and "mapping said accessed resource to said virtual community area by said uniform resource locator (URL)" (URL invitation to group, paragraph [0030]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Pearlman and Sutherland because using the steps of "a plurality of virtual community areas, where each of said plurality of resources is mapped to one said plurality of virtual community areas by a uniform resource locator (URL) and each of said plurality of virtual community areas contains community and user accessing information for said mapped resource' and "mapping said accessed resource to said virtual community area by said uniform resource locator (URL)" would have given those skilled in the art the tools to improve the invention by improving access to information within the

community. This gives the user the advantage of having a common browser interface whereby all users can access the pages.

Claim 60 has been amended. It now differs from Pearlman's invention in a similar way as described in the above argument. In particular, Sutherland's method does not contain steps of forming a dynamic community based on users accessing a resource. Thus withdrawal of the rejection of claim 60 as anticipated by Pearlman and Sutherland appears in order and is therefore respectfully requested.

Most other claims which are dependent to Claim 1, 60 and 73 remain with amendments. Since Claims 1, 60 and 73 have all been amended; thus, withdrawal of the rejection of other claims as anticipated by Pearlman appears in order and is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above reasons, it is submitted that claims 1-30, 60-101 are allowable and applicant respectfully request an early notice to such effect. The applicant thanks very much for the work of the examiner during the phone interview, especially to much of the correction and recommendations on applicant's lack of patent practice or skills since the applicant is filing by individual inventor. The applicant would also greatly appreciate if the respectful examiner could tell if there is any points in the patent applications contain patentable or allowable points in the office action even though there are further rejections on those amended claims.

Respectfully submitted,



Yongyong Xu

408-215-8485

yongyongxu@yahoo.com